

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1-36 stand rejected. Assignee traverses the rejections.

### ***Examiner's Interview***

Assignee's representative would like to thank Examiner Kan and the Examiner's supervisor Kakali Chaki for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, John V. Biernacki, during the telephone interview on November 16, 2005. During the interview, the parties discussed the cited JSX reference in relation to the office action's remarks about serialization of private object state data and further discussed the cited JSX reference in relation to the office action's remarks about serialization and human-readable file. The ability to store the order in which the private object state data is to be restored was discussed relative to claim 11. The remarks and the amendments contained herein further summarize the interview.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Johnson (XML JavaBeans series, Part 1-3, published 2-7/1999, JavaWorld (hereinafter "Johnson") in view of JSX (JSX history, 11/2000); hereinafter "JSX", 11/2000). Assignee traverses the instant rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to persisting private object state data that was created within an object development environment. Through the amendment contained herein, claim 1 recites limitations that had been contained in dependent claim 22. With the amendment,

claim 1 recites in combination with its other limitations that there is a determination as to whether the private object state data of the objects has been modified from initial values given to the objects upon the objects' creation. The private object state data that has been determined to have been modified is stored in a computer-readable file, wherein the computer-readable file is in a human-understandable format, thereby allowing a text editing computer program to directly edit the computer-readable file.

Such limitations of claim 1 provide many benefits. For example, the persistence of object state data in a human-understandable format (such as a text human-readable format) allows a component designer to modify object structures (such as object classes) outside of the development environment through a wide range of techniques. For example, the component designer may directly edit the file to alter the object structure or use different file editors (e.g., XML parsing mechanisms) to alter the object structure. The component designer can more easily correct errors or update object structures without having to reenter the development environment. If the data were persisted in a proprietary binary format, the component designer would have significant difficulty in modifying the object structure outside of the development environment. Because the limitations of claim 1 are not disclosed by any of the cited references, claim 1 should be allowed and proceed to issuance. Because claim 1 is allowable, the dependent claims of claim 1 are also allowable and should proceed to issuance.

It is noted that dependent claim 22 has been amended to further accentuate the benefit of the computer-readable file being in a human-understandable format by expressly reciting that the computer-readable file being in a human-understandable format allows for a user to modify object structures without having to reenter the object

development environment. Because none of the cited references disclose such limitations, claim 22 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to recite that first private object state data is determined to be restored before second private object state data because of an interdependency between the first private object state data and the second private object state data. The XML tags are generated such that a restoration order is indicated, and the restoration order indicates that during restoration the first private object state data is to be restored before the second private object state data. There is no disclosure in the cited references whatsoever of *determining* a restoration order “because of an *interdependency* between the first private object state data and the second private object state data” as required by claim 26. Accordingly claim 26 is allowable and should proceed to issuance. Because claim 26 is allowable, the dependent claims of claim 26 are also allowable and should proceed to issuance.

With respect to independent claim 32, claim 32 expressly recites in combination with its other limitations a “means for determining that an interdependency exists between first private object state data and second private object state data” for use in specifying a restoration order. Because none of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest any type of determination of an interdependency existing between first and second private object state data, claim 32 is allowable and should proceed to issuance. Because claim 32 is allowable, the dependent claims of claim 32 are also allowable and should proceed to issuance.

### CONCLUSIONS

For the above-stated reasons, claims 1-36 are allowable over the cited reference.

Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Apr. 11, 2006

By: John V. Biernacki  
John V. Biernacki  
Reg. No. 40,511  
JONES DAY  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-3939